

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ATTORNEYS

Please refer to the rating factors below. Check one response for each statement.

ATTORNEY SETTLEMENT OFFICER PANEL PROCESS	6	5	4	3	2	1
2. When this matter was assigned to an Attorney Settlement Officer, I was pessimistic about its benefits.						
3. At least one attorney was not adequately prepared for the procedure.						
4. At least one party did not participate in good faith in the procedure.						
5. At least one attorney did not participate in good faith in the procedure.						
6. Additional discovery was needed prior to the procedure.						
7. The procedure helped the parties better express their personal interest, concerns and emotions.						
8. Compared to resolving this case without an Attorney Settlement Officer, the procedure decreased the amount of formal discovery.						
9. Compared to resolving this case without an Attorney Settlement Officer, the procedure decreased the number of motions filed.						
10. Compared to resolving this case without an Attorney Settlement Officer, the procedure helped reduce the cost (attorney fees, court costs, wages lost from Employment) to my client to litigate this case.						
11. Compared to resolving this case without an Attorney Settlement Officer, the procedure helped reduce the time to resolve this case.						
12. The procedure narrowed the issues in dispute.						
13. The procedure allowed the parties to better understand and evaluate the other side's position.						
14. The procedure generated creative settlement options not otherwise considered.						

6=Strongly Agree

5=Agree

4=Neither

3=Disagree

2=Strongly Disagree

1=No Response

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ATTORNEYS

Please refer to the rating factors below. Check one response for each statement.

Attorney Settlement Officer Panel Process, cont.	6	5	4	3	2	1
15. The procedure encouraged the parties to consider methods other than litigation to resolve their dispute.						
16. The procedure encouraged the parties to be more realistic about the strengths and/or weaknesses of their respective positions in this case.						
17. The procedure hardened positions, making a negotiated outcome more difficult.						
18. The procedure enabled the clients to actively participate in the dispute resolution process.						
19. The procedure enabled the attorneys to actively participate in the dispute resolution process.						
20. The procedure was less of an emotional toll to my client than the litigation process or anticipation of the litigation process.						
21. The attempt to resolve this matter through a procedure (as compared to litigation) helped the parties maintain a continuing relationship.						
22. I voluntarily used the Attorney Settlement Officer Panel to reduce litigation costs.						
23. I voluntarily used the Attorney Settlement Officer Panel to resolve this case more quickly.						
24. I voluntarily used the Attorney Settlement Officer Panel so that someone would facilitate settlement discussions.						
25. I voluntarily used the Attorney Settlement Officer Panel because this process was the least burdensome of the settlement options.						

6=Strongly Agree

5=Agree

4=Neither

3=Disagree

2=Strongly Disagree

1=No Response

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ATTORNEYS

Please refer to the rating factors below. Check one response for each statement.

Attorney Settlement Officer Panel Process, Cont.	6	5	4	3	2	1
26. I voluntarily used the Attorney Settlement Officer Panel to avoid the judge/magistrate selecting an attorney settlement officer for me.						
27. Overall, the benefits of the procedure outweighed the disadvantages.						
28. I was satisfied with the procedure process.						
29. (If you voluntarily used Attorney Settlement Officer Panel): I would use this option of the Attorney Settlement Officer Panel under Local Rule 23 again.						
30. Even though I was assigned an Attorney Settlement Officer, for future cases, I would use this option of the Attorney Settlement Officer Panel under Local Rule 23.						
SETTLEMENT OUTCOME						
31. The disputed matter was resolved before the procedure.						
32. The disputed matter was not resolved by the procedure, but the procedure resulted in meaningful agreements on future case management.						
33. The disputed matter was not resolved by the procedure, but the parties agreed to revisit the possibility of settlement at a specified future time.						
34. I believe the parties will comply with the terms of the settlement reached as a result of the procedure.						
35. I was satisfied with the procedure outcome.						
ATTORNEY SETTLEMENT OFFICER EVALUATION						
36. The Attorney Settlement Officer was adequately prepared to discuss the matter.						

6=Strongly Agree

5=Agree

4=Neither

3=Disagree

2=Strongly Disagree

1=No Response

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ATTORNEYS

Please refer to the rating factors below. Check one response for each statement.

Attorney Settlement Officer Evaluation, cont.	6	5	4	3	2	1
37. The Attorney Settlement Officer was effective in facilitating meaningful discussion between the parties.						
38. The Attorney Settlement Officer had a good knowledge of the facts and issues of this case.						
39. The Attorney Settlement Officer had an appropriate level of subject matter expertise.						
40. The Attorney Settlement Officer was fair and impartial.						
41. The Attorney Settlement Officer was well prepared.						
42. The Attorney Settlement Officer was a good listener.						
43. The Attorney Settlement Officer adequately informed me about the purpose of the procedure and my responsibilities.						
44. The Attorney Settlement Officer followed the rules of the settlement procedure procedures.						
45. I was satisfied with the process used to select the Attorney Settlement Officer.						
46. I would use this Attorney Settlement Officer again.						

COMMENTS:

6=Strongly Agree 5=Agree 4=Neither 3=Disagree 2=Strongly Disagree 1=No Response